

REMARKS

This Response is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed August 20, 2008.

Claims 1-4, 11-20, 23-24 and 27-44 were rejected as being unpatentable over a combination of Nachom and Tso. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested, for the following reasons.

Claim 1 is reproduced below:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for a first server to select content to be displayed on a computer accessing a Web site of a second server, comprising the steps of:

the second server collecting user identification data from the computer accessing the Web site;

the second server sending the collected user identification data to the first server;

the first server retrieving user information corresponding to the user identification data from a database of user information accessible to the first server;

the first server applying the retrieved user information to a rule base including a plurality of rules;

the first server selecting advertising to be displayed on the second server's Web site based upon a result of the application of the retrieved user information to at least one of the plurality of rules;

the first server sending an address of the selected advertising to the accessing computer, and

causing the accessing computer to fetch the selected advertising from the address sent to the accessing computer and to integrate the fetched advertising into a currently displayed page of the Web site.

Note the second step, wherein the second server sends the collected user identification data to the first server. The Final Office Action identified Col. 5, lines 19-21 of Nachom as teaching this step: "*Nachom teaches the first server ... sending data to the first server*" However, the claimed embodiment does not recite just "data" being sent to the first server, but the user identification data collected by the second server in the first claimed step. Indeed, this "user

identification data” is not merely generic “data” or some unspecified “functional descriptive data or material”, but is

- a) what is collected by the first claimed step;
- b) what is sent by the second claimed server to the first claimed server;
- c) what forms the basis of the retrieving step carried out by the first server as it retrieves user information corresponding to the user identification data from a database of user information accessible to the first server;
- d) the basis of what gets applied to the rule base in the applying step carried out by the first server, and
- e) ultimately the basis of the advertising whose address is sent by the first server to the accessing computer, fetched by the accessing computer and integrated into the currently displayed page of the Web site, as claimed.

Instead, Nachom teaches for the Site A (the first server 16) to send a GET request to Site B (the second server 24) for information that is related to the subject matter on Site A. The GET request sent from first server 16 to second server 24 is not disclosed in Nachom to be or include user identification data, but merely data related to the currently displayed products and/or services. See Nachom, Col 5, lines 10-26.

In response to the GET request, the second server 24 searches a database, retrieves information related to the currently displayed products and/or services for sale from Site B (the second server 24), and sends a pop-up or a URL to the client user.

Nachom does not teach or suggest, whether considered alone or in combination with Tso (which is relied on solely for its teaching of rules (see page 3 of outstanding Office Action)), the following claimed steps:

- 1) Nachom/Tso do not teach or suggest sending anything that was collected from the user to a first server, as claimed in the second recited step of claim 1:

“the second server sending the collected user identification data to the first server;”

Instead, Nachom teaches that the client may well logon to Site A, but specifically chooses not to send any such information to the second server 24. Instead, Nachom teaches that information related to the products/services currently displayed on Site A are sent to the second server 24 – not any collected user identification data, as required by the claim.

- 2) Nachom/Tso do not teach or suggest retrieving user information that corresponds to the user identification collected from the user from a database, as claimed herein:

“the first server retrieving user information corresponding to the user identification data from a database of user information accessible to the first server;”

Indeed, Nachom/Tso teaches to retrieve information “related to the subject matter on Site A” (Col. 5, lines 19-21 and 27-30).

- 3) Nachom/Tso do not teach or suggest that the first server applies the retrieved user information to a rule base, as claimed herein:

“the first server applying the retrieved user information to a rule base including a plurality of rules;”

Indeed, the applied combination teaches/suggests that the offer (i.e., the popup or URL) generated as a result of the second server 24 searching the stored database (See Col. 5, lines 28-30) is retrieved based upon the product/service information of Site A, sent to the second server 24 by the first server 16. Therefore, the applied combination does not teach or suggest any user information retrieved as a result of any second server sending collected user identification data to the first server.

- 4) Therefore, the information 26 sent to the client user, in Nachom, is not selected based upon any collected user data, as required by the claim, but merely upon products/services that may be displayed on Site A.

Simply put, it is respectfully submitted that the applied combination does not teach or suggest any server sending any user identification data collected from a user to another server for the purpose of enabling the other server to search and select advertising or other content to be integrated into a Web site. In Nachom, what is submitted to the second server 24 are the products/services displayed on Web site A, and it is on that basis that the second server 24 sends a popup or a URL to the client user.

Missing from the applied combination, therefore, are any of the steps after the second server collects user identification data from the computer accessing the Web site (the first claimed step).

Therefore, even when Nachom is combined with Tso's rules, the applied combination fails to teach or to suggest the claimed embodiments, and actually teaches away from the claimed embodiments in which user identification data is collected from the accessing computer by a second server, sent to a first server to form the basis of subsequent database searching and application of rules and, ultimately, fails to teach or to suggest which user identification-specific advertising gets integrated into the currently displayed page of the Web site served by the second server to the accessing computer, as claimed herein.

Indeed, Nachom explicitly teaches that it is the URL that is requested by the user that forms the basis of subsequent requests to the second server 24, as explicitly stated in Col. 5, lines 18-21:

In a preferred embodiment, when a specific URL is requested, such as <http://www.asite.com>, first server 16 will send a request to second server 24 to provide information 26 that may be related to the subject matter on site A. Infor-

... and not any collected user identification data, as claimed herein. This step, understandably, yields a very different result as do the claimed steps of the presently claimed embodiments, and would not teach or suggest the claimed steps and/or structure to one of ordinary skill in the art. Indeed, the person of ordinary skill in this art would be motivated to use product or services information (displayed on the web site of Server A) as the basis for a second server generating a Popup or a URL, as taught by Nachom, after applying the product or services information to a plurality of rules, as taught by Tso. Missing and wholly untaught and unsuggested by the applied combination are any of the steps:

the second server collecting user identification data from the computer accessing the Web site;

the second server sending the collected user identification data to the first server;

the first server retrieving user information corresponding to the user identification data from a database of user information accessible to the first server;

the first server applying the retrieved user information to a rule base including a plurality of rules;

of claim 1.

The use of user identification data in the claimed steps enables the generation of targeted advertising, as noted on page 8 of the specification:


The user information retrieved from the user information database 142 that corresponds to the collected user identification data may then be applied to a rule base 144 (a store or database of rules) that includes a plurality of rules, as shown by arrow 108. The rules, according to the present invention, may be fully customizable to achieve virtually any business goal, such as to carry out targeted advertising, to carry out an advertising campaign or for purposes wholly unrelated to advertising.

Such is not possible if the basis upon which the second server 24 generates its popup or URL is simply the product and/or service currently displayed on Site A.

The other independent claims recite similar steps and structure and are also not taught or suggested by the applied combination of references. In view of the pending claims and the above Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that it is manifest that the applied combination actually teaches away from the claimed embodiments and in no way teaches and/or suggests the currently pending claimed subject matter. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejections applied to the claims are respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that this application is now in condition for allowance. If any unresolved issues remain, please contact the undersigned attorney of record at the telephone number indicated below and whatever is necessary to resolve such issues will be done at once.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 20, 2008

By: _____

Alan W. Young
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,970

YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C.
4370 Alpine Rd., Ste. 106
Portola Valley, CA 94028
Tel.: (650) 851-7210
Fax: (650) 851-7232

C:\YLF\CLIENTS\ORCL\5672\5672 AMEND.5.doc